

**NORTH WEST LEICESTERSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**  
**LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE – TUESDAY 11 MARCH 2025**



<b>Title of Report</b>	<b>LOCAL PLAN - PROPOSED HOUSING ALLOCATIONS IN THE KEY SERVICE CENTRES, LOCAL SERVICE CENTRES AND SUSTAINABLE VILLAGES</b>	
<b>Presented by</b>	Ian Nelson Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager	
<b>Background Papers</b>	<p>Report to Local Plan Committee - 27 October 2021 <a href="#">Development Strategy Local Plan Committee Report.pdf</a></p> <p>Report to Local Plan Committee – 27 September 2022 <a href="#">Local Plan Review - Development Strategy Local Plan Committee Report.pdf</a></p> <p>Report to Local Plan Committee – 17 January 2024 <a href="#">Agenda for Local Plan Committee on Wednesday, 17th January, 2024, 6.00 pm - North West Leicestershire District Council</a></p> <p>Report to Local Plan Committee – 22 May 2024 <a href="#">Agenda for Local Plan Committee on Wednesday, 22nd May, 2024, 6.00 pm - North West Leicestershire District Council</a></p> <p><a href="#">Report to Local plan Committee – 14 August 2024</a></p> <p>Report to Local Plan Committee – 13 November 2024</p>	<p><b>Public Report: Yes</b></p>

	<p><a href="#">Local Plan - Plan period, Housing and Employment requirements Local Plan Committee report.pdf</a></p> <p><a href="#">Draft North West Leicestershire Local Plan 2024</a></p> <p><a href="#">Report to Local Plan Committee – 16 December 2024</a></p> <p><a href="#">National Planning Policy Framework (publishing.service.gov.uk)</a></p> <p>Responses to Regulation 18 consultation <a href="#">New Local Plan - North West Leicestershire District Council</a></p> <p><a href="#">Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (2021)</a></p> <p><a href="#">Statement of Community Involvement</a></p> <p><a href="#">Infrastructure Delivery Plan</a></p> <p><a href="#">Additional housing sites: proformas</a></p> <p><a href="#">Additional housing sites: site assessments</a></p>	
<b>Financial Implications</b>	<p>The cost of the Local Plan Review is met through existing budgets which are monitored on an ongoing basis.</p> <p><b>Signed off by the Section 151 Officer: Yes</b></p>	
<b>Legal Implications</b>	<p>The Local Plan must be based on robust and up to date evidence.</p> <p><b>Signed off by the Monitoring Officer: Yes</b></p>	
<b>Staffing and Corporate Implications</b>	<p>No staffing implications are associated with the specific content of this report. Links with the Council's Priorities are set out at the end of the report.</p> <p><b>Signed off by the Head of Paid Service: Yes</b></p>	

<p><b>Purpose of Report</b></p>	<p>To consider the Regulation 18 consultation responses made in respect of the proposed housing allocations in the Key Service Centres, Local Service Centres and Sustainable Villages and to agree the preferred sites to take forward for allocation in the Regulation 19 plan.</p>
<p><b>Recommendations</b></p>	<p><b>THAT SUBJECT TO THE OUTCOME OF FURTHER WORK INCLUDING TRANSPORT MODELLING, VIABILITY ASSESSMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS, THE LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE AGREES THAT:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. THE EXISTING ALLOCATION AT MONEY HILL ASHBY DE LA ZOUC(A5) BE RECONFIRMED</b></li> <li><b>2. LAND SOUTH OF BURTON ROAD, ASHBY DE LA ZOUC (A27) BE PROPOSED TO BE ALLOCATED FOR AROUND 60 DWELLINGS IN THE REGULATION 19 VERSION OF THE PLAN</b></li> <li><b>3. LAND ADJACENT TO 194 BURTON ROAD (A31) ASHBY DE LA ZOUC BE PROPOSED TO BE ALLOCATED FOR AROUND 30 DWELLINGS IN THE REGULATION 19 VERSION OF THE PLAN, SUBJECT TO THE OUTCOME OF FURTHER CONSULTATION</b></li> <li><b>4. LAND WEST OF CASTLE DONINGTON (CD10) BE PROPOSED TO BE ALLOCATED FOR AROUND 1,076 DWELLINGS IN THE REGULATION 19 VERSION OF THE PLAN</b></li> <li><b>5. LAND SOUTH OF PARK LANE, CASTLE DONINGTON (CD9) BE PROPOSED TO BE ALLOCATED FOR AROUND 35 DWELLINGS IN THE REGULATION 19 VERSION OF THE PLAN, SUBJECT TO THE OUTCOME OF FURTHER CONSULTATION</b></li> <li><b>6. LAND OFF LEICESTER ROAD, IBSTOCK (IB18) BE PROPOSED TO BE ALLOCATED FOR AROUND 450 DWELLINGS IN THE REGULATION 19 VERSION OF THE PLAN</b></li> <li><b>7. LAND AT HIGH STREET, IBSTOCK (IB20) BE PROPOSED TO BE ALLOCATED FOR AROUND 46 DWELLINGS IN THE REGULATION 19 VERSION OF THE PLAN SUBJECT TO THE OUTCOME OF FURTHER CONSULTATION</b></li> </ol>

	<p>8. LAND SOUTH OF ASHBY ROAD, KEGWORTH (K12) BE PROPOSED TO BE ALLOCATED FOR AROUND 140 DWELLINGS IN THE REGULATION 19 VERSION OF THE PLAN SUBJECT TO THE OUTCOME OF FURTHER CONSULTATION</p> <p>9. LAND OFF LEICESTER ROAD/ASHBY ROAD, MEASHAM (M11) BE PROPOSED TO BE ALLOCATED FOR AROUND 300 DWELLINGS IN THE REGULATION 19 VERSION OF THE PLAN SUBJECT TO THE OUTCOME OF FURTHER CONSULTATION</p> <p>10. LAND AT ABNEY DRIVE, MEASHAM (M14) BE PROPOSED TO BE ALLOCATED FOR AROUND 150 DWELLINGS IN THE REGULATION 19 VERSION OF THE PLAN SUBJECT TO THE OUTCOME OF FURTHER CONSULTATION</p> <p>11. LAND AT OLD END (AP15) AND 40 MEASHAM ROAD, APPLEBY MAGNA (AP17) NOT BE TAKEN FORWARD AS A HOUSING ALLOCATION IN THE REGULATION 19 VERSION OF THE PLAN; BUT BE INCLUDED IN THE LIMITS TO DEVELOPMENT FOR APPLEBY MAGNA</p> <p>12. LAND AT MEASHAM ROAD, APPLEBY MAGNA (AP1) BE PROPOSED TO BE ALLOCATED FOR AROUND 37 DWELLINGS IN THE REGULATION 19 VERSION OF THE PLAN SUBJECT TO THE OUTCOME OF FURTHER CONSULTATION</p> <p>13. LAND OFF RAMSCLIFF AVENUE, DONISTHORPE (D8) BE PROPOSED TO BE ALLOCATED FOR AROUND 32 DWELLINGS IN THE REGULATION 19 VERSION OF THE PLAN</p> <p>14. LAND OFF MIDLAND ROAD, ELLISTOWN (E7) BE PROPOSED TO BE ALLOCATED FOR AROUND 69 DWELLINGS IN THE REGULATION 19 VERSION OF THE PLAN</p> <p>15. LAND ADJACENT TO SPARKENHOE ESTATE, HEATHER (H3) BE PROPOSED TO BE ALLOCATED FOR AROUND 37 DWELLINGS IN THE REGULATION 19 VERSION OF THE PLAN</p>
--	---

	<p>16. LAND OFF ASHBY ROAD, MOIRA (MO8) BE PROPOSED TO BE ALLOCATED FOR AROUND 49 DWELLINGS IN THE REGULATION 19 VERSION OF THE PLAN</p> <p>17. LAND AT SCHOOL LANE, OAKTHORPE (OA5) BE PROPOSED TO BE ALLOCATED FOR AROUND 47 DWELLINGS IN THE REGULATION 19 VERSION OF THE PLAN</p> <p>18. LAND SOUTH OF NORMANTON ROAD, PACKINGTON (P4) BE PROPOSED TO BE ALLOCATED FOR AROUND 10 DWELLINGS IN THE REGULATION 19 VERSION OF THE PLAN</p> <p>19. LAND WEST OF REDBURROW LANE, PACKINGTON (P7) BE PROPOSED TO BE ALLOCATED FOR AROUND 30 DWELLINGS IN THE REGULATION 19 VERSION OF THE PLAN, SUBJECT TO THE OUTCOME OF FURTHER CONSULTATION AND THE RESOLUTION OF HIGHWAY MATTERS</p> <p>20. IN THE EVENT THAT HIGHWAY MATTERS IN RESPECT OF SITE P7 ARE NOT SATISFACTORILY RESOLVED, THENLAND TO THE REAR OF 55 NORMANTON ROAD (P5 &amp; P8) BE CONSIDERED FOR AROUND 23 DWELLINGS, IN THE REGULATION 19 VERSION OF THE PLAN, SUBJECT TO THE OUTCOME OF FURTHER CONSULTATION</p> <p>21. LAND AT CHURCH LANE, RAVENSTONE (R9) BE PROPOSED TO BE ALLOCATED FOR AROUND 50 DWELLINGS IN THE REGULATION 19 VERSION OF THE PLAN, SUBJECT TO THE OUTCOME OF FURTHER CONSULTATION</p> <p>22. LAND AT HEATHER LANE, RAVENSTONE (R12) BE PROPOSED TO BE ALLOCATED FOR AROUND 85 DWELLINGS IN THE REGULATION 19 VERSION OF THE PLAN</p> <p>23. SUBJECT TO THE OUTCOME OF FURTHER CONSULTATION, LAND AT PACKINGTON NOOK, ASHBY DE LA ZOUCH (A7) BE IDENTIFIED AS A RESERVE HOUSING ALLOCATION IN THE EVENT THAT THE GOVERNMENT HAS NOT REMOVED THE HS2</p>
--	--

	<p><b>SAFEGUARDING ON THE FOLLOWING SITES BY THE TIME THAT THE REGULATION 19 LOCAL PLAN IS AGREED BY THE COUNCIL:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>LAND WEST OF HIGH STREET, MEASHAM (SHELAA REFERENCE M9); AND</b></li> <li>• <b>LAND NORTH OF ASHBY ROAD, KEGWORTH (SHELAA REFERENCE K7); AND</b></li> <li>• <b>LAND SOUTH OF DERBY ROAD, KEGWORTH (SHELAA REFERENCE K11).</b></li> </ul> <p><b>THE PROVISION OF ABOUT 9HA OF LAND FOR GENERAL NEEDS EMPLOYMENT ADJOINING JUNCTION 12 OF THE A42 WOULD ALSO BE SUPPORTED AS PART OF A COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT IN THE CIRCUMSTANCES OUTLINED ABOVE</b></p>
--	--

## **1 INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 The Local Plan Committee of [17 January 2024](#) agreed the draft housing and employment allocations for consultation purposes. The consultation was undertaken between 5 February and 17 March 2024 and is referred to as ‘the *Regulation 18 consultation*’ in this report.
- 1.2 A report to the [22 May 2024](#) Local Plan Committee provided an overview of the consultation in respect of the number of responses and the sources of representatives.
- 1.3 The Local Plan Committee of [13 November 2024](#) resolved to extend the plan period to 2042 with an annual housing requirement of 686 dwellings.
- 1.4 A report on the proposed housing allocations in the Principal Town (Coalville Urban Area) and the proposed New Settlement (Isley Woodhouse) was presented to the [16 December 2024](#) Local Plan Committee. Further details on the outcome of that meeting of the committee and the implications for this report are set out in Section 3 below.
- 1.5 A report on the proposed housing allocations in the Key Service Centres, Local Service Centres and Sustainable Villages was due to be considered at the 29 January 2025 Local Plan Committee. However, prior to the meeting, the Council received further information regarding the safeguarding of the HS2 route which confirmed that the government has no immediate plans (or timetable) to lift the safeguarding (compared to the previous government who advised the safeguarding

would be removed in summer 2024). This latest update means there is uncertainty about when (or if) the 426 dwellings at Measham Waterside and 251 dwellings on the western side of Kegworth (which benefit from planning permission) can be delivered. As a result, the Local Plan should address the implications arising from the fact that the safeguarding route will not be lifted for the foreseeable future. The 29 January 2025 report on housing allocations was deferred so that they could be dealt with at the same time as the HS2 issue.

- 1.6 This report follows on from the 16 December 2024 and 29 January 2025 committees by:
- Reporting and responding to those matters raised in the Regulation 18 consultation relating to housing sites in the Key Service Centres, Local Service Centres and Sustainable Villages;
  - Recommending which sites should be taken forward for allocation as part of the Regulation 19 plan, **subject to** the outcome of other evidence base work, including transport modelling; and
  - Recommending a solution for dealing with the uncertainty surrounding the delivery of 677 homes in Measham and Kegworth as a result of the safeguarded HS2 route.

## 2 STRUCTURE OF THIS REPORT

- 2.1 This report is structured as follows:
- **Section 3** provides background information, primarily focusing upon the outcomes of the 16 December Local Plan Committee (LPC).
  - **Sections 4 to 6** focus on the Key Service Centres, the Local Service Centres and the Sustainable Villages.
  - **Section 7** focuses on those Sustainable Villages where housing is (or is proposed to be) allocated in a Neighbourhood Plan.
  - **Section 8** deals with Local Plan representations promoting sites in other settlements (i.e. those lower down the settlement hierarchy).
  - **Section 9** considers how the Local Plan should address the ongoing issue of the HS2 safeguarded route.
  - **Section 10** considers the implications of the recommendations and sets out a revised distribution strategy.
  - **Section 11** sets out the next steps in moving the Local Plan forward.
- 2.2 In accordance with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, the Council is required to “take into account any representations made to them”. Sections 4 to 6, as well as summarising and responding to representations made in relation to the proposed housing allocations, also summarise and respond to representations made in support of other potential housing sites. Underpinning the report are several appendices.
- 2.3 **Appendix A** incorporates site plans for additional sites that have been assessed since the end of the Regulation 18 consultation; sites which have had their

boundaries amended; and sites that are now proposed for allocation (and which did not form part of the Regulation 18 consultation). It also includes a proposed amendment to the Limits to Development for Appleby Magna. This amendment was not resolved at the 29 January 2025 Local Plan Committee, as a decision needs to be made alongside this report, which proposes a different housing allocation for Appleby Magna (see Section 6 of this report).

2.4 **Appendices B to P** incorporate the following information:

- **Site reference number** – this corresponds to the Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA). Where sites were submitted after publication of the 2021 SHELAA the numbering sequence for each settlement was continued.
- **Site name** – as above.
- **Main issues raised** – this summarises and groups together the various comments made. It should be noted that not all respondents necessarily made exactly the same points but made comments on similar themes.
- **Council response** – officers have provided a response to the comments.
- **Action** – this summarises any actions required in response to the comments made.
- **Respondent's ID** – each person/ organisation responding to the consultation was given a unique number
- **Respondent's name** – provides the name of the individual or organisation and (if relevant) on whose behalf their comments are made.

2.5 **Appendices Q and R** deal with the issue of the HS2 safeguarded route.

2.6 The appendices are included separately to enable members to be able to have easy access to both the report and the appendices at the same time. For clarity, the complete list of appendices is:

- **Appendix A:** Site plans
- **Appendix B:** Ashby de la Zouch consultation responses (A5; A27 and alternative sites)
- **Appendix C:** Castle Donington consultation responses (CD10)
- **Appendix D:** Ibstock consultation responses (Ib18 and alternative sites)
- **Appendix E:** Kegworth consultation responses (alternative sites)
- **Appendix F:** Measham consultation responses (alternative sites)
- **Appendix G:** Appleby Magna consultation responses (Ap15/Ap17 and alternative sites)
- **Appendix H:** Donisthorpe consultation responses (D8 and alternative sites)
- **Appendix I:** Ellistown consultation responses (E7)
- **Appendix J:** Heather consultation responses (H3 and alternative sites)
- **Appendix K:** Moira consultation responses (Mo8 and alternative sites)
- **Appendix L:** Oakthorpe consultation responses (Oa5 and alternative sites)
- **Appendix M:** Packington consultation responses (P4 and alternative sites)
- **Appendix N:** Ravenstone consultation responses (R12 and alternative sites)
- **Appendix O:** Consultation responses for sites in settlements which have

- allocated, or are proposing to allocate, housing through Neighbourhood Plans
- **Appendix P:** Consultation responses for sites in other settlements
- **Appendix Q:** Options for dealing with the HS2 safeguarded route
- **Appendix R:** Distribution options for the potential HS2 shortfall

2.7 **Sections 4 to 6** also confirm any additional sites which have been assessed since the Regulation 18 consultation ended (the additional [site proformas](#) and [site assessments](#) can be found on the Council's website).

### **3 BACKGROUND**

3.1 The report presented to the 16 December 2024 Local Plan Committee provided an update of the proposed allocations which formed part of the Regulation 18 consultation, and the number of consultation responses received for each allocation site (see Table 1 of the [16 December report](#)).

3.2 Paragraphs 3.3 to 3.6 of the [16 December committee report](#) provided an evidence base update and paragraphs 3.7 to 3.10 provided a commentary on the site allocation requirements. Those paragraphs are also applicable to this report.

#### **Housing Requirements**

3.3 The report presented to 16 December 2024 Local Plan Committee confirmed that as at 1 April 2024, and based upon an annual requirement of 686 dwellings, the Local Plan has to identify sites to accommodate **7,147 dwellings** between 2024 and 2042 (see **Table 2** of that [report](#)). As a result of the ongoing uncertainty surrounding the safeguarded HS2 route, the Local Plan also needs to consider the possibility that 426 homes with planning permission at Measham Waterside and 251 homes on the western side of Kegworth may not be delivered in the plan period.

#### **Housing in the Principal Town (Coalville Urban Area) and the New Settlement**

3.4 The [16 December Local Plan Committee](#) dealt with the proposed housing sites in the Coalville Urban Area and the New Settlement (Isley Woodhouse). Additional housing sites in the Coalville Urban Area were put forward at this committee, on the basis that: it was agreed at the [13 November 2024](#) Local Plan Committee to extend the plan period by two years; and the amount of homes that could be delivered at the New Settlement was fewer than originally anticipated.

3.5 At the 16 December committee, it was resolved to proceed with the sites shown in **Table 1** below.

**Table 1: Proposed housing allocations in the Coalville Urban Area and the New Settlement**

Site ref.	Site address	Approximate no. of dwellings (2024 to 2042)
<b>New Settlement</b>		<b>1,950</b>
IW1	New Settlement	1,950
<b>Principal Town (Coalville Urban Area)</b>		<b>2,457</b>
C18	Land off Thornborough Road	105
C19A	Land at Torrington Avenue, Whitwick	242
C19B	Land off Stephenson Green, Coalville	700
C46	Broom Leys Farm, Broom Leys Road, Coalville	266
C48	Land south of Church Lane, New Swannington	283
C74	Land at Lily Bank, Thringstone	64
R17	Land at Coalville Lane/Ravenstone Road, Coalville	153
C47, C77, C78, C81 and C86	Land west of Whitwick	350
C90	Land south of The Green, Donington le Heath	62
C92	Former Hermitage Leisure Centre, Silver Street, Whitwick	32
-	Coalville Town Centre	200
<b>Total Principal Town + New Settlement</b>		<b>4,407</b>

- 3.6 The Local Plan Committee resolved that subject to the outcome of further work including transport modelling, viability assessment and infrastructure requirements:
- Sites **IW1, C46, C48, C74, R17, West of Whitwick** and **C92** should proceed to the Regulation 19 version of the Plan.
  - The 200 dwellings included in and around **Coalville Town Centre** should proceed to the Regulation 19 version of the Plan, **subject to specific sites being identified.**
  - Sites **C18, C19A, C19B** and **C90** (which were not identified as proposed allocations in the Regulation 18 consultation) should proceed to the Regulation 19 version of the Plan, **subject to the outcome of further consultation.**

- 3.7 **Table 1** shows that the Council is currently looking to take forward around **4,407 homes** in the New Settlement and the Coalville Urban Area to the Regulation 19 version of the Plan.

#### **Housing in the remainder of the district**

- 3.8 This committee report considers how to deal with the residual housing requirement of **2,740 dwellings** (i.e. the total requirement of 7,147 dwellings minus the 4,407 in the New Settlement and the Coalville Urban Area). It also considers how to deal with the ongoing uncertainty surrounding the delivery of **677 dwellings** in Kegworth and Measham.

- 3.9 **Table 2** sets out the housing sites in the Key Service Centres, Local Service Centres and Sustainable Villages which were proposed for allocation in the Regulation 18 consultation document.

**Table 2: Proposed housing allocations in the remainder of the district (Regulation 18 consultation)**

Site ref.	Site address	Approximate no. of dwellings (2024 to 2042)
<b>Key Service Centres</b>		<b>1,126*</b>
A5	Money Hill, Ashby-de-la-Zouch	1,200
A27	South of Burton Road, Ashby	50
CD10	Land west of Castle Donington	1,076
<b>Local Service Centres</b>		<b>450</b>
lb18	Leicester Road, Ibstock	450
<b>Sustainable Villages</b>		<b>334</b>
Ap15/Ap17	Measham Road, Appleby Magna	32
D8	Ramscliff Avenue, Donisthorpe	32
E7	Midland Road, Ellistown	69
H3	Adjacent Sparkenhoe Estate, Heather	37
Mo8	Ashby Road, Moira	49
Oa5	School Lane, Oakthorpe	47
P4	Normanton Road, Packington	18
R12	Heather Lane, Ravenstone	50

\*This figure does not include Money Hill (A5), which is an existing allocation in the adopted Local Plan and so has already been counted towards the Council's housing supply.

- 3.10 Section 5 of the 16 December 2024 committee report provided a reminder of the housing distribution strategy which was agreed at the 27 September 2022 Local Plan Committee. The agreed distribution strategy is referred to as 'Option 7b'.
- 3.11 **Table 3** below provides an update on the distribution strategy following the outcome of the 16 December 2024 Local Plan Committee. It compares the number of dwellings required in each tier of the settlement hierarchy under Option 7b with: a) the number of dwellings it was agreed to progress at the 16 December LPC (see **Table 1** above); and b) the number of dwellings proposed in the Regulation 18 consultation in the Key Service Centres, Local Service Centres and Sustainable Villages (as referenced in **Table 2**).

**Table 3: Revised distribution of housing (Option 7b) following 16 December 2024 Local Plan Committee**

	Option 7b Distribution (%)	Option 7b Distribution (dwellings)	16 December LPC Proposed Allocations (dwellings)	Difference (dwellings)
<b>Principal Town (Coalville Urban Area)</b>	35	2,501	2,457	-44
<b>New Settlement</b>	35	2,501	1,950	-551
	Option 7b Distribution (%)	Option 7b Distribution (dwellings)	Regulation 18 Proposed Allocations (dwellings)	Difference (dwellings)
<b>Key Service Centres</b>	15	1,072	1,126	54
<b>Local Service Centres</b>	10	715	450	-265
<b>Sustainable Villages</b>	5	358	334	-24
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>7,147</b>	<b>6,317</b>	<b>-830</b>

- 3.12 The amount of development anticipated from the Principal Town is slightly lower than that required under Option 7b (a shortfall of 44 dwellings). However, the amount of development anticipated from the New Settlement is significantly lower than that required under Option 7b (by some 551 dwellings) and accounts for the majority of the district-wide shortfall of 830 dwellings.
- 3.13 In terms of the shortfall in the Principal Town, all reasonable alternatives have been considered in previous reports to this Committee on 15 November 2023, 17 January 2024 and 16 December 2024. There are no other remaining sites to be considered. The shortfall is very small proportionally and is not considered to represent a risk to the plan in terms of its soundness.
- 3.14 The remainder of this report considers the sites proposed for allocation at Regulation 18 stage as well as the potential options for addressing the shortfall from the New Settlement and the Coalville Urban Area and the options for dealing with a potential shortfall of 677 dwellings in Kegworth and Measham.

## **4 THE KEY SERVICE CENTRES**

### **What is the requirement?**

- 4.1 The district's Key Service Centres are **Ashby de la Zouch** and **Castle Donington**. As shown in **Table 3**, based upon an extended plan period to 2042 and an annual housing requirement of 686 dwellings, the requirement in the Key Service Centres under Option 7b would be **1,072 dwellings**. The **1,126 dwellings** proposed to be allocated in the Regulation 18 consultation therefore represents a slight oversupply of 54 dwellings. Despite this oversupply, given that there is a shortfall arising from the

Principal Town and the New Settlement, it is appropriate to consider whether there are any further sites which could be allocated in the Key Service Centres.

### **Ashby-de-la-Zouch**

- 4.2 The Regulation 18 consultation proposed to reallocate **Money Hill** (the part without planning permission) for around 1,200 dwellings (**A5**) and allocate **Land south of Burton Road (A27)** for around 50 dwellings. Because Money Hill is already allocated in the adopted Local Plan, the housing is included as part of the Council's future housing commitments and so *does not* form part of the 7,147 dwellings that needs to be found as part of the new Local Plan.
- 4.3 Following the end of the Local Plan consultation:
- A [site proforma](#) and a detailed [site assessment](#) have been prepared for an additional site at **Land adjacent to 194 Burton Road (A31)** (this site is mapped at **Appendix A**).
  - All representations made in relation to the proposed allocations at **Money Hill (A5)** and **South of Burton Road (A27)** have been summarised and responded to (**Appendix B**).
  - All representations made in relation to four other potential housing sites in Ashby (**Packington Nook/Land south of Ashby (A7)**; **North of Moira Road (A25)**; **South of Moira Road (A26)**; and **Land adjacent to 194 Burton Road (A31)**) have been summarised and responded to (**Appendix B**).
- 4.4 No information was submitted to the consultation that changes the recommendations to reallocate land at **Money Hill (A5)** and to allocate **Land south of Burton Road (A27)**.
- 4.5 As a result of the consultation and ongoing discussions with the site promoters / statutory consultees, some changes are proposed to the policy at Regulation 19 stage in respect of **Money Hill (A5)** including:
- Amendment to the Ashby Inset Policies Map to include areas of employment land at Money Hill.
  - Deletion of the requirement at (1)(d) for a new primary school, on the basis that Leicestershire County Council would prefer a two-form entry primary school on the approved school site (rather than 2 one form entry schools).
- 4.6 The main proposed change to the proposed allocation at **Land south of Burton Road (A27)** is an increase in capacity from around 50 to around 60 dwellings. The figure of 50 dwellings was based on information previously provided by the site promoters. However, a new masterplan was submitted with their representations which would appear to accord with all other proposed policy requirements. The figure of 60 dwellings accords with the SHELAA methodology.

## **Castle Donington**

- 4.7 The Regulation 18 consultation proposed to allocate around 1,076 dwellings at **Land west of Castle Donington (CD10)**.
- 4.8 Following the end of the consultation, all representations made in relation to CD10 have been summarised and responded to (**Appendix C**). Comments were varied, focusing on the implications of the proposed allocation on the local road network and infrastructure and various environmental impacts. Several representations focused upon the proposed extent of the site boundary/site capacity. These are summarised below.

### **Noise**

- 4.9 The owners of Donington Park Circuit stated that the proposed development should not restrict the operation of the racetrack or the associated Donington Hall hotel. It was suggested that because the site is downwind of the circuit, the southern half of CD10 should be excluded from the allocation.
- 4.10 In response, consultants have been commissioned to undertake a noise assessment which will assist in determining the parameters for built development. This will include taking appropriate noise readings from both Donington Park and East Midlands Airport and assessing any potential implications for the site (e.g. in terms of capacity/mitigation). This work will be completed in spring 2025 when race meetings have started again and will be reported to a future meeting of this Committee.

### **Heritage Assets**

- 4.11 Several comments were made relating to the impact of the proposals upon local designated heritage assets and in particular focused on the mitigation required for the southern and western boundaries of the site:
- The owners of Donington Park Circuit argued that the proposals would impact the setting of Donington Hall and that the Local Plan should be more detailed about the landscaping mitigation proposed and what degree of screening it would provide to the Hall.
  - Castle Donington Parish Council said a meaningful area of separation is required between the development and Kings Mills.
  - Historic England advised that it was unclear whether the landscape buffer concept was an appropriate one for the parkland area.
  - The Council's Conservation Officer noted that the site allocation boundary extended further west than he had previously advised and that land containing archaeological earthworks should be retained as agricultural use rather than 'open space and landscaping'
- 4.12 Further work is required on part 2(l) of the Plan which deals with heritage matters. It is recommended that further discussion with the above stakeholders and the site promoters are held, but at this time there is no reason to suggest that the development cannot be adequately mitigated in heritage terms.

## ***Ecology***

- 4.13 Several local residents objected to the inclusion of Dalby's Covert (known locally as Bluebell Woods) within the allocation boundary, feeling it would be subsequently destroyed and developed for housing. Whilst footfall through the woods would undoubtedly increase as a result of the allocation, the proposals would be subject to an Ecological Management Plan and protected as open space in any planning permission and accompanying Section 106 legal agreement.
- 4.14 Elsewhere, the consultation has resulted in the following proposed amendments to the policy:
- Changing part (1)(e) to reference the **safeguarding of land for a two-form entry primary school** (this would equate to c.2 hectares of land). The local education authority has indicated that demand for primary education could be met by extending Foxbridge Primary from a one to a two-form entry, with the balance to be met at other primary schools. However, given the size of the site, land should be safeguarded in case the position changes later in the plan period. It should be noted that if a school is not required on the site, there is the potential for more homes to be delivered as part of the overall development.
  - The deletion of part (2)(g) requiring the existing overhead pylons to be removed. Based upon the information put forward by the site promoters, it would not be reasonable to include this policy requirement.

## **Potential additional sites in the Key Service Centres**

### ***Ashby-de-la-Zouch***

- 4.15 Four sites in Ashby were promoted through the Local Plan representations (**Appendix B**).
- 4.16 **Land south of Moira Road (A26)** and **Land north of Moira Road (A25)**, are located on the west side of Ashby de la Zouch. Several constraints were identified as part of the original [site assessment](#) exercise. A further consideration is that additional development on the west side of the town is likely to exacerbate existing traffic issues in the town centre, given that the town's supermarkets, employment opportunities and access to the A42 are on the eastern side of the town.
- 4.17 **Packington Nook/Land south of Ashby (A7)** is a large site capable of accommodating about 1,100 dwellings. Allocation of the site would not only meet the residual shortfall for the whole district (see **Table 3**) but would also provide an additional c.300 dwellings. Unlike A26, the development would be of a scale that would require on-site services and amenities (and could potentially provide some new employment land). Allocating this site would result in a significant scale of growth in Ashby given that Money Hill is anticipated to be built out over much of the plan period. Whilst there is the possibility of allocating a smaller part of the site, this would result in a piecemeal (rather than a comprehensive) development. In short, there would be more potential benefits to allocating the whole site in terms of

infrastructure and in the interests of sensible planning. The allocation of the whole site is considered further within the context of potentially identifying a reserve site due to HS2 (see **Section 9**).

- 4.18 **Land adjacent to 194 Burton Road (A31)** is an additional site that has now been [assessed](#). Whilst it is located on the western side of Ashby (like A25 and A26), it is a smaller site so would have a reduced traffic impact. Furthermore, it is conveniently located for the local facilities (school, GP, pharmacy, shop) to the north of Burton Road. The SHELAA methodology results in a capacity of around 47 dwellings for the size of the site. However, its shape and topography mean that the impact upon the amenity of existing properties is a key consideration. As such, it is recommended that the allocation of the site for a lower quantum of development is consulted on (in the region of 30 dwellings). Whilst development of this site would not make a significant impact upon the shortfall, it provides a further development opportunity in Ashby that could be delivered in the short-term.

### ***Castle Donington***

- 4.19 No other sites in Castle Donington were promoted through the Local Plan and the original [site assessment](#) demonstrated there are a lack of available and suitable alternative sites.
- 4.20 However, should Land west of Castle Donington progress as a final allocation in the Plan, this would result in a smaller site to the south of Park Lane (**CD9** – mapped at **Appendix A**) being included in the Limits to Development as it would not be reasonable to keep this land designated as countryside. Whilst this site was not promoted through the Local Plan, several developers have expressed an interest in developing the site over the last 12 months. The original site assessment confirmed that the development of CD9 would not be appropriate without the development of CD10, but given the shortfall expressed in **Table 3** it is reasonable to consider this site for allocation as part of the wider development in this location. Any future policy for CD9 would need to specify the provision of a buffer to the adjacent Studbrook Hollow (a candidate Local Wildlife Site) and consider the relationship / appropriate boundary treatment with the adjacent woodland and open space. The SHELAA methodology results in a capacity of 45 dwellings at this site, but given the above policy requirements, it is recommended that a lower quantum of development is consulted on (in the region of 35 dwellings).

### **Recommendations for the Key Service Centres**

- 4.21 **It is recommended that:**
- **Money Hill. Ashby-de-la-Zouch (A5) be proposed to be allocated for 1,200 dwellings in the Regulation 19 version of the plan.**
  - **Land south of Burton Road, Ashby-de-la-Zouch (A27) be proposed to be allocated for 60 dwellings in the Regulation 19 version of the plan.**
  - **Land adjacent to 194 Burton Road, Ashby de la Zouch (A31) be proposed to be allocated for around 30 dwellings in the Regulation 19 version of the plan subject to the outcome of further consultation.**
  - **Land west of Castle Donington (CD10) be proposed to be allocated for**

around 1,076 dwellings in the Regulation 19 version of the plan.

- Land south of Park Lane (CD9) be proposed to be allocated for around 35 dwellings in the Regulation 19 version of the plan subject to the outcome of further consultation.

4.22 Subject to the above recommendations being approved, the revised housing provision in the Key Service Centres would be as set out in **Table 4** (the sites not proposed in the Regulation 18 consultation are *in italics* and are mapped at **Appendix A**). The table does not include Money Hill for the reasons described in paragraph 4.2 above.

**Table 4: Proposed Housing Allocations in the Key Service Centres**

Site Reference	Site Address	Number of dwellings (Approximate)
<b>Key Service Centres</b>		<b>1,201</b>
A27	South of Burton Road, Ashby de la Zouch	60
A31	<i>Land adjacent to 194 Burton Road, Ashby de la Zouch</i>	30
CD9	<i>Land South of Park Lane, Castle Donington</i>	35
CD10	Land west of Castle Donington	1,076

## 5 THE LOCAL SERVICE CENTRES

### What is the requirement?

5.1 The district's Local Service Centres are **Ibstock**, **Kegworth** and **Measham**. As shown in **Table 3**, based upon an extended plan period to 2042 and an annual housing requirement of 686 dwellings, the requirement in the Local Service Centres under Option 7b would be **715 dwellings**. The **450 dwellings** proposed to be allocated in the Regulation 18 consultation (at a single site in Ibstock) therefore represents an **undersupply of 265 dwellings**. Together with the shortfall from the Principal Town and New Settlement, there is a need to consider whether any additional dwellings could be allocated at the Local Service Centres.

#### **Ibstock**

5.2 The Regulation 18 consultation document proposed to allocate around 450 dwellings at **Land off Leicester Road (Ib18)**.

5.3 Following the end of the consultation:

- Site [proformas](#) and [detailed site assessments](#) for two additional sites at **Land south of Water Meadow Way (Ib31)** and **Land between Hinckley Road and Overton Road (Ib32)** have been prepared (these sites are mapped at **Appendix A**).
- All representations made in relation to the proposed allocation at **Land off Leicester Road (Ib18)** have been summarised and considered (**Appendix D**).
- All representations made in relation to three other potential housing sites in Ibstock (**Land rear of 111a High Street (Ib20)**, **Land south of Curzon Street**

**(Ib24)** and **Land south of Water Meadow Way (Ib31)** have been summarised and considered (**Appendix D**).

5.4 A total of 47 representations were made in relation to Ib18. Comments were predominantly from local residents, who raised concerns about whether further housing in Ibstock was actually needed as well as the impact of development upon matters including, but not limited to, traffic levels, road safety, local infrastructure and wildlife/biodiversity. Hugglescote and Donington le Heath Parish Council objected to the inclusion of the part of the site which is located in their parish boundary.

5.5 Key points to note are:

- Following the consultation, the highways authority has since confirmed that it would not object to a second access onto the A447, subject to delivering a development which would sufficiently urbanise the road and therefore help slow down traffic. It is understood that the site promoters are addressing this.
- Some local resident concerns (traffic levels etc) are subject to further evidence based reports, the outcomes of which will be reported to Local Plan Committee at a later date.
- Other concerns relate to matters (for example the impact upon existing public rights of way) that will be dealt with at planning application stage and are not things that should affect the principle of development at this stage.
- It is not unusual for development sites to extend beyond one parish area to another or even a local authority boundary to another. The piece of land referred to is in closer proximity to the built-up edge of Ibstock than the built-up edge of Hugglescote or Donington le Heath. If developed, the site would be seen as an extension of Ibstock and the fact that this additional land is not in Ibstock parish is not reason alone for discounting it as such.

5.6 It is recommended that the Council continues to progress the allocation of **Ib18**.

#### **Potential additional sites in Ibstock**

5.7 [Site assessments](#) have now been prepared for **Land south of Water Meadow Way (Ib31)** and **Land between Hinckley Road and Overton Road (Ib32)** and representations in support of **Ib31** were also submitted to the Local Plan consultation. However, there are several major constraints associated with these sites, that would mean they are not recommended for allocation.

5.8 Representations supporting the allocation of **Land rear of 111a High Street (Ib20)** and **Land south of Curzon Road (Ib24)** were also submitted (**Appendix D**).

5.9 **There** was no information submitted in support of **Land south of Curzon Road (Ib24)** which would change the previous assessment of this site and so it is *not* suggested that it should be allocated for development.

5.10 **Land rear of 111a High Street (Ib20)** is a site which was previously allocated for housing in an earlier Local Plan. At that time, development did not come forward due to land ownership issues and highways concerns about the site access. There are

also heritage concerns given that the proposed access would require the removal of a brick wall in the Ibstock Conservation Area. The site promoters have put forward a solution as part of their representations and whilst the Conservation Officer would prefer that the access to the site was not through the Conservation Area, he has advised that a requirement for the access to the site “*to avoid or minimise harm to the Conservation Area and other designated heritage assets as far as possible*” should be incorporated into the policy. On this basis, it is recommended that Ib20 would be a suitable site to help meet the identified shortfall and, subject to further consultation, should be allocated for around 46 dwellings.

## **Kegworth**

- 5.11 The Regulation 18 consultation document did not propose any additional housing allocations in Kegworth. At the time that the proposed housing allocations were agreed at the 17 January 2024 Local Plan Committee, the (previous) government had just cancelled the eastern leg of HS2 (Phase 2b). Therefore, this represented a change of circumstance as it gave more certainty that 251 dwellings with planning permission could be delivered at:
- Land adjoining 90 Ashby Road (110 dwellings)
  - Adjacent to Computer Centre and J24, Packington Hill (141 dwellings)
- 5.12 Almost 12 months on from the HS2 announcement, the safeguarded route is still in place and it is not known when it will be removed (the previous government said this would take place in summer 2024). The ongoing uncertainty surrounding HS2 is a further reason why it is appropriate to consider whether any further sites could be allocated in Kegworth.
- 5.13 Representations have been made on behalf of Caddick Land (**Appendix E**), who have highlighted concerns about the delivery of the above two sites and suggested that the Local Plan allocates **Land to the south of Ashby Road, Kegworth (SHELAA reference K12)** for housing (this site is mapped at **Appendix A**). This site is a ‘reserve’ allocation in the adopted Local Plan (site reference **H3d**) meaning it has been deemed sound through the Local Plan examination process. It is also a relatively small site (around 140 dwellings) which could deliver in the short term; this is particularly relevant given the scale of development sites proposed elsewhere in the north of the district and the need to provide a balance to the number of new jobs that are potentially going to be created in this part of the district.
- 5.14 It is also material to note that Caddick Land is proposing to develop the site for a mixture of Build to Rent and affordable (rented) homes. The benefit of such a scheme is that the dwellings would not be available on the open market and therefore could not be changed into Housing in Multiple Occupation (HMOs), which is a local concern in Kegworth.

## Measham

- 5.15 The issues surrounding HS2 which are described in relation to Kegworth above also apply to Measham. In short, it was considered that the cancellation of HS2 gave more certainty that the 426 dwellings at Measham Waterside could be delivered in the new Local Plan timeframe. As a result, the Regulation 18 consultation did not propose any additional housing allocations in Measham.
- 5.16 Following the end of the consultation:
- A site [proforma](#) and a [site assessment](#) have been prepared for an additional site at **Land north of Bosworth Road (M18)** (this site is mapped at **Appendix A**).
  - All representations relating to other potential housing sites in Measham (**Land off Leicester Road/Ashby Road (M11)**; **Land at Abney Drive (M14)** and **Land north of Bosworth Road (M18)**) and/ or concerns regarding the delivery of Measham Waterside have been summarised and considered (**Appendix F**).
- 5.17 One site promoter inferred that the adopted Local Plan strategy has resulted in limited growth taking place since the start of the adopted Local Plan period (2011). Since 2011, 288 homes (net) have been built in Measham (an average of 22 a year), which is comparatively low compared to the other Local Service Centres. This is a further consideration that would mean it would be reasonable to revisit the strategy for Measham.
- 5.18 The adopted Local Plan includes a reserve site; **Land off Leicester Road/Ashby Road (SHELAA reference M11 / Local Plan reference H3c)**. Given the uncertainty surrounding HS2 and the need to identify more housing sites, it is recommended that this be proposed as part of the Regulation 19 Plan for about 300 dwellings, subject to further consultation. It should be noted that there is a live planning application for up to 300 dwellings at this site and the main outstanding technical information relates to the River Mease. Other statutory consultees (e.g the local highways authority, the Coal Authority) do not object to the proposals subject to specific planning conditions being attached to any future planning permission.
- 5.19 In addition, **Land at Abney Drive (M14)** is a further reasonable option for allocation. It is well-located in respect of services and facilities and would represent a logical rounding off of this part of Measham. The site promoter is proposing that the site is allocated for 199 dwellings. Given that a full application has been submitted to the Council for 150 dwellings and there is no evidence before officers on how the additional 49 dwellings would be accommodated, it is recommended that the site, subject to further consultation, proceeds as an allocation for 150 dwellings in the Regulation 19 Plan. This site is not allocated for development in the adopted Local Plan. This, together with outstanding technical issues relating to the River Mease, is why the application has yet to be determined.

## Recommendations for the Local Service Centres

5.20 It is recommended that:

- Land off Leicester Road, Ibstock (Ib18) be proposed to be allocated for around 450 dwellings in the Regulation 19 version of the plan.
- Land rear of 111a High Street (Ib20) be proposed to be allocated for around 46 dwellings in the Regulation 19 version of the plan, subject to the outcome of further consultation.
- Land south of Ashby Road (K12), Kegworth be proposed to be allocated for around 140 dwellings in the Regulation 19 version of the plan, subject to the outcome of further consultation.
- Land off Leicester Road/Ashby Road (M11), Measham be proposed to be allocated for around 300 dwellings in the Regulation 19 version of the plan, subject to the outcome of further consultation.
- Land at Abney Drive (M14), Measham be proposed to be allocated for around 150 dwellings in the Regulation 19 version of the plan, subject to the outcome of further consultation.

5.21 The revised proposed provision for new housing in the Local Service Centres is set out in **Table 5** (sites not proposed in the Regulation 18 consultation are *in italics* and are mapped at **Appendix A**).

**Table 5: Proposed Housing Allocations in the Local Service Centres**

Site Reference	Site Address	Number of dwellings (Approximate)
<b>Local Service Centres</b>		<b>1,086</b>
Ib18	Land off Leicester Road, Ibstock	450
<i>Ib20</i>	<i>Land rear of 111a High Street, Ibstock</i>	46
<i>K12</i>	<i>Land south of Ashby Road, Kegworth</i>	140
<i>M11</i>	<i>Land off Leicester Road/Ashby Road, Measham</i>	300
<i>M14</i>	<i>Land off Abney Drive, Measham</i>	150

5.22 The allocation of these additional sites would bring the total new allocations at the Local Service Centres to 1,086 dwellings which significantly contributes towards, but does not fully meet, the shortfall identified in **Table 3**.

## 6 THE SUSTAINABLE VILLAGES

### What is the requirement?

6.1 The Regulation 18 consultation proposed housing allocations in the Sustainable Villages of **Appleby Magna, Donisthorpe, Ellistown, Heather, Moira, Oakthorpe, Packington** and **Ravenstone**. Sustainable Villages which have allocated (or are proposing to allocate) housing in a neighbourhood plan are dealt with in **Section 7** below. Those villages are **Blackfordby, Swannington, Long Whatton** and **Diseworth**.

- 6.2 As shown in **Table 3**, based upon an extended plan period to 2042 and an annual housing requirement of 686 dwellings, the requirement in the Sustainable Villages under Option 7b would be **358 dwellings**. The **334 dwellings** proposed to be allocated in the Regulation 18 consultation represents a slight undersupply of 24 dwellings against Option 7b.
- 6.3 However, if you take into account the recommendations made so far in this report for the Key and Local Service Centres, there remains a district-wide shortfall of 57 dwellings. All of the Sustainable Villages are considered to be potentially suitable to accommodate further development.
- 6.4 Representations to the draft plan in respect of the settlement hierarchy sought to elevate the status of both Appleby Magna and Ravenstone in view of their relationship to Mercia Park and the Coalville Urban Area respectively ([report to Local Plan Committee 14 August 2024](#)). It is considered that neither settlement displays the necessary characteristics to be higher order settlements. However, in the case of Ravenstone, it has a good range of services and facilities, including regular public transport to Coalville and there is a clear functional relationship between the two settlements. Appleby Magna does not have such a good range of services and facilities, notwithstanding the proximity to Mercia Park. Therefore, in the first instance, consideration will be given to whether there are any additional sites in Ravenstone that should be proposed to be allocated to address the shortfall.

### **Appleby Magna**

- 6.5 The Regulation 18 consultation proposed to allocate around 32 dwellings at **Land at Old End (Ap15) and 40 Measham Road (Ap17)**.
- 6.6 Following the end of the consultation:
- All representations made in relation to the proposed allocation at **Land at Old End (Ap15) and 40 Measham Road (Ap17)** have been summarised and considered (**Appendix G**).
  - All representations made in relation to other potential housing sites in Appleby Magna (**Land West of Measham Road (Ap1)**, **Church Street (Ap3 including Ap14)**, **Land at Top Street (Ap6)** and **Land East and West of Measham Road, (Ap13a, Ap13b & Ap13c)** and **Land east of Appleby Magna (Ap16)**) have been summarised and considered (**Appendix G**).
- 6.7 A total of 11 representations were made in relation to Ap15 and Ap17. Comments mainly related to the deliverability of Ap15 and Ap17 as a single site, the quantum of development proposed for Ap15 and Ap17, the scale of housing in the settlement, highway considerations, environmental considerations including flooding and site-specific policy requirements.

6.8 Key points to note are:

- Ap15 and Ap17 are under different ownership and although there appears to be some willingness between the site promoters to undertake discussion in terms of their comprehensive development, the lack of meaningful progress raises uncertainty over the deliverability of these two sites as a single allocation.
- If the sites are considered individually Ap15 is sieved out as an allocation as it has a capacity of less than 10 dwellings.
- With reference to Ap17, the site promoter has since confirmed that the site area has been reduced in size. An amended site plan shows the site to no longer include the existing house at 40 Measham Road and its eastern boundary extends further into Flood Zone 3. These changes will impact on the layout of development i.e. development should be kept away from Flood Zone 3. Considering this along with the character of housing in the locality, particularly the lower density development to the south, there is uncertainty regarding the ability of Ap17 to deliver 10 or more dwellings.

6.9 As a result of the consultation and in light of additional information received from site promoters, some changes are proposed for Appleby Magna:

- Delete Ap15 and Ap17 as a housing allocation, due to issues relating to their deliverability as a comprehensive development and the subsequent capacity of each individual site, and consider these sites independently from one another.
- Include land at Ap15 and Ap17 within the Limits to Development (LtD) as shown at **Appendix A**. The site assessment work undertaken concluded that the principle of development of these sites is considered acceptable. The land has a strong visual relationship with the village, emphasised by the fact that there is an existing dwelling on part of the land, and does not appear as a substantial tract of open countryside (methodology point 5) with residential development to both the north and the south. Including land within the LtD would create a logical boundary (methodology point 4) and would connect development to the north and the south within a continuous LtD (methodology point 7).
- Identify an alternative housing allocation in Appleby Magna.

***Alternative Allocation***

6.10 No additional or new housing sites have been put forward in Appleby Magna beyond those included in the SHELAA and which were assessed in preparing the draft Local Plan. Having reconsidered all existing sites in Appleby Magna, including those where representations were made, it is concluded that **Land West of Measham Road (Ap1)** is most suitable for allocation (see **Appendix G**).

6.11 **It is recommended that:**

- **Land at Old End (Ap15) and 40 Measham Road (Ap17) not be taken forward in the Regulation 19 version of the plan.**
- **Land at Old End (Ap15) and 40 Measham Road (Ap17) be included within**

**the Limits to Development in the Regulation 19 version of the plan.**

- **Land at Measham Road (Ap1) be proposed to be allocated for around 37 dwellings in the Regulation 19 version of the plan subject to the outcome from further consultation.**

### **Donisthorpe**

- 6.12 The Regulation 18 consultation document proposed to allocate around 32 dwellings at **Land off Ramscliff Avenue (D8)**.
- 6.13 Following the end of the consultation:
- Site assessments have been prepared for the additional sites that have been promoted at **Land east of Measham Road (D14)** and **Land south of Ashby Road (D15)** (these sites are mapped at **Appendix A**).
  - All representations made in relation to the proposed allocation at **Land off Ramscliff Avenue (D8)** have been summarised and considered (**Appendix H**).
  - All representations made in relation to two other potential housing sites in Donisthorpe (**Chapel Street (D2)** and **Land off Talbot Place (D11)**) have been summarised and considered (**Appendix H**).
- 6.14 A total of nine representations were made in relation to D8. Comments mainly related to land stability and contamination and the loss of an alternative route for the Ashby Canal.
- 6.15 Key points to note are:
- The Environment Agency (EA) has advised that the site is classed as an 'active' landfill and that regular gas monitoring has not taken place.
  - The site is owned by Leicestershire County Council (LCC) who is seeking to undertake the necessary monitoring to terminate the EA licence.
  - LCC is progressing work on the site in respect of access, design, a foul and storm water strategy and land stability.
  - It is LCC's normal practice to bring sites to the market immediately on the grant of an outline planning permission.
  - Other concerns relate to matters (for example the impact upon existing public rights of way) that will be dealt with at planning application stage and are not things that should affect the principle of development.
- 6.16 It is proposed to amend the policy in relation to this site allocation to require the provision of a Coal Mining Risk Assessment as part of any planning application.
- 6.17 Whilst new sites have been submitted at **Land east of Measham Road (D14)** and **Land south of Ashby Road (D15)** and representations made in support of **Chapel Street (D2)**, **Land off Talbot Place (D11)** and **Land south of Ashby Road (D15)** (**Appendix H**) were submitted to the Local Plan consultation, no information was provided that would suggest that they should be allocated instead of the preferred site.

6.18 It is recommended that:

- **Land off Ramscliff Avenue (D8) be proposed to be allocated for around 32 dwellings in the Regulation 19 version of the plan.**

### **Ellistown**

6.19 The Regulation 18 consultation document proposed to allocate around 69 dwellings at **Land at Midland Road, Ellistown (E7)**.

6.20 Following the end of the consultation, all representations made in relation to the proposed allocation at **Land at Midland Road (E7)** have been summarised and considered (**Appendix I**). A total of 18 representations were made in relation to E7. Comments mainly related to the scale of housing development, the separation between Ellistown and Hugglescote, highway safety and access, infrastructure provision and environmental considerations.

6.21 Key points to note are:

- The local highway authority is satisfied that a safe and suitable access can be achieved from Midland Road. The allocation does not propose a link road, and no specific highway concerns have been raised about the impact on the double mini- roundabout. However, the developer will need to consider the road safety of any proposed development, and any road safety impacts will need to be mitigated.
- In terms of the site's relationship with the proposed employment site on the east of Midland Road (EMP24), it is noted that changes are recommended to EMP24 to reduce its scale with no access onto Midland Road. In these circumstances there is less of a requirement to plan these two sites together.
- The site promoters have suggested there is an opportunity to allocate a larger site should it be necessary to increase the housing numbers and a concept plan has been provided. However, it is considered that there is no need to allocate additional land in Ellistown to meet the district's housing requirement.
- Other concerns relate to matters (for example the impact upon existing public rights of way, heritage and landscaping) that will be dealt with at the planning application stage and are not things that should affect the principle of development at this stage.
- Some amendments to the policy are required to make clear that some hedgerows may need to be removed to accommodate access but should otherwise be retained.
- Since the Regulation 18 consultation a planning application has been submitted for this site proposing a development of 75 dwellings (24/01618/OUTM). This application is currently under consideration and no decision has been made on the proposal.

6.22 It is recommended that:

- **Land off Midland Road (E7) be proposed to be allocated for around 69 dwellings in the Regulation 19 version of the plan.**

### Heather

6.23 The Regulation 18 consultation document proposed to allocate around 37 dwellings at **Land Adjacent to Sparkenhoe Estate, Heather (H3)**.

6.24 Following the end of the consultation:

- All representations made in relation to the proposed allocation at **Land Adjacent to Sparkenhoe Estate (H3)** have been summarised and considered (**Appendix J**).
- All representations made in relation to two other potential housing sites in Heather (**Land off Newton Road (H1)** and **Land at Swebstone Road (H2)**) have been summarised and considered (**Appendix J**).

6.25 A total of four representations were made in relation to H3. Comments mainly related to housing type, infrastructure provision, environmental considerations and site-specific policy requirements.

6.26 Key points to note are:

- The local highway authority is satisfied that a suitable access can be achieved from the adjacent development at Gadsby Road.
- The site promoters have prepared a development framework which proposes the inclusion of additional land to the north with a total capacity of 115 dwellings. However, it is considered that there are more suitable Sustainable Villages in which to meet the housing shortfall identified in Table 3 above.
- Other concerns relate to matters (for example the impact upon existing public rights of way) that will be dealt with at the planning application stage and are not things that should affect the principle of development at this stage.
- Some amendments to the policy are required to make clear that:
  - Recognition that some hedgerow may need to be removed to accommodate the access but should otherwise be retained. Amend the requirement at 2 (c).
  - The existing landscaping along the west boundary is considered robust in terms of screening. Delete the requirement at 2 (d) that seeks the provision of a high-quality landscaping scheme along this boundary.
  - Delete reference to brick clay in respect of the Minerals Assessment.

6.27 Whilst representations supporting the allocation of **Land off Newton Road (H1)** and **Land at Swebstone Road (H2)** were also submitted, no information was provided that would suggest that they should be allocated instead of the preferred site.

6.28 **It is recommended that:**

- **Land Adjacent to Sparkenhoe Estate (H3) be proposed to be allocated for around 37 dwellings in the Regulation 19 version of the plan.**

**Moira**

6.29 The Regulation 18 consultation document proposed to allocate around 49 dwellings at **Land off Ashby Road (Mo8)**.

6.30 Following the end of the consultation:

- A site assessment has been prepared for an additional site put forward at **Land west of Donisthorpe Lane (Mo17)**. A second additional site was submitted at **82 Donisthorpe Lane (Mo16)** however, this site did not pass the stage 2 sieve of the site assessment process as it has a capacity of less than 10 dwellings (both sites are mapped at **Appendix A**).
- All representations made in relation to the proposed allocation at **Land off Ashby Road (Mo8)** have been summarised and considered (**Appendix K**).
- All representations made in relation to three other potential housing sites in Moira (**Land adjacent to Fire Station, Shortheath Road (Mo10)** and **Land at Blackfordby Lane, Norris Hill (Mo12)**) have been summarised and considered (**Appendix K**).

6.31 A total of five representations were made in relation to Mo8. Comments mainly related to the deliverability of the site, scale of development, highway issues and minerals/spent mining activity.

6.32 Key points to note are:

- The site is being promoted by a land promoter who advises that the landowner has been approached by several housebuilders who are seeking to purchase the site.
- Several technical investigations have been commissioned to evidence the deliverability of the site along with a Vision Document for the site.
- The site promoter considers that the allocation could be extended further northward to accommodate 80 dwellings based on the capacity of the site in the SHELAA and Moira Site Assessment (93 dwellings). Development on the rear part of the site would be out of character and at a significant depth compared to the current built form. As such it would represent an encroachment into the countryside.
- The Highway Authority has confirmed that in principle access would be achievable off Ashby Road.
- Other concerns relate to matters that will be dealt with at planning application stage and are not things that should affect the principle of development at this stage (for example the impact upon residential amenity).

6.33 Whilst a new site at **Land west of Donisthorpe Lane (Mo17)** has been submitted and representations in support of **Land adjacent to Fire Station, Shortheath Road (Mo10)** and **Land at Blackfordby Lane, Norris Hill (Mo12)** were submitted to the Local Plan consultation there are several constraints associated with these sites that mean they are not recommended for allocation.

6.34 **It is recommended that:**

- **Land off Ashby Road (Mo8) be proposed to be allocated for around 49 dwellings in the Regulation 19 version of the plan.**

#### **Oakthorpe**

6.35 The Regulation 18 consultation document proposed to allocate around 47 dwellings at **Land at School Lane, Oakthorpe (Oa5)**.

6.36 Following the end of the consultation:

- All representations made in relation to the proposed allocation at **Land at School Lane, Oakthorpe (Oa5)** have been summarised and considered (**Appendix L**).
- All representations made in relation to one other potential housing site in Oakthorpe (**Land at School Lane, Oakthorpe (Oa7)**) have been summarised and considered (**Appendix L**).

6.37 A total of five representations were made in relation to Oa5. Comments mainly related to environmental considerations including flooding and site-specific policy requirements.

6.38 Key points to note are:

- The Highway Authority advises that access off School Street is not a suitable option but have not raised any highway safety concerns regarding access through the adjacent Home Farm development. As the road that serves Home Farm remains private and has not been adopted by the Local Highways Authority, any development served from this site would remain private and would be subject to the relevant land ownership. The site promoter has confirmed that access rights through this site are available to the site owner.
- The site promoter has since confirmed that land to the south of the allocation is available for the provision of SuDs, public open space and BNG. The allocation has therefore been extended to include this land to the south to allow for this provision.
- The Local Lead Flood Authority has advised that this allocation is within the catchment of the flooding issue on Burton Road. As part of any planning application, they will seek the development of this site to either provide a betterment to greenfield or contribute to downstream flood alleviation and expect any drainage strategy not to increase flood risk.
- Other concerns relate to matters (for example the impact upon existing public rights of way) that will be dealt with at planning application stage and are not

things that should affect the principle of development at this stage.

- Some amendments to the policy are required to make clear that:
  - The site will be extended to include land to the south (see **Appendix A**).
  - Housing development will be contained within the northern part of the site and the southern area will only be used in connection with SuDS, BNG, open space and National Forest Planting.

6.39 Whilst a representation supporting the allocation of Land at School Lane (Oa7) was also submitted, no information was provided that would suggest that this site should be allocated instead of the preferred site.

6.40 **It is recommended that:**

- **Land at School Lane (Oa5) be proposed to be allocated for around 47 dwellings in the Regulation 19 version of the plan.**

### **Packington**

6.41 The Regulation 18 consultation document proposed to allocate around 18 dwellings at **Land south of Normanton Road (P4)**.

6.42 Following the end of the consultation:

- All representations made in relation to the proposed allocation at **Land south of Normanton Road (P4)** have been summarised and considered (**Appendix M**).
- All representations made in relation to other potential housing sites in Packington (**Land adjacent to 17 Spring Lane (P5)**, **Land west of Redburrow Lane (P7)** and **Land adjacent to 17 Spring Lane and Land to the rear of 55 Normanton Road (P5 & P8)** have been summarised and considered (**Appendix M**).

6.43 A total of six representations were made in relation to P4. Comments mainly related to the capacity of P4, highway considerations, environmental considerations including flooding, and site-specific policy requirements.

6.44 Key points to note are:

- The site promoter for P4 suggests the site has a capacity of 10 dwellings with an indicative layout submitted in support. Given the irregular shape of the site, officers concur with the proposed capacity of this site.
- Packington experiences flooding events and although this allocation is downstream of those properties at high risk of flooding and unlikely to contribute directly to flood risk, the Local Lead Flood Authority have advised that they would seek to discuss ways this allocation could reduce flood risk. This would be dealt with at the planning application stage.
- The site is identified as being within an area safeguarded for coal but given its scale and siting adjacent to existing houses, it is questionable whether the coal reserves would be worked. As a consequence, Leicestershire County Council have raised no objection.

- Some amendments to the policy are required to make clear that the capacity of the P4 allocation is reduced to around 10 dwellings.
- Since the Regulation 18 consultation a planning application has been submitted for this site proposing a development of 9 dwellings (25/00224/FUL). This application is currently under consideration and no decision has been made on the proposal.

### ***Additional Allocation***

- 6.45 Given the proposal to reduce the capacity of P4 it would be reasonable to identify an additional housing allocation for Packington. No additional housing sites have been put forward in Packington that are not already included in the SHELAA.
- 6.46 Having reconsidered all existing sites in Packington, including those where representations were made it is recommended that **Land west of Redburrow Lane (P7)** is the preferred additional allocation on several grounds, including capacity and relationship with the existing settlement. However, there are several outstanding highways matters principally relating to visibility and the introduction of a new vehicular access close to existing vehicular access points. The site promoter is currently engaging with the highway authority to find a solution to this issue.
- 6.47 In light of unresolved highways matters relating to P7, it is recommended that consideration also be given to the comprehensive development of **Land to the rear of 55 Normanton Road (P5 & P8) as an alternative should the highway matters pertaining to P7 not be satisfactorily resolved.** The uncertainty over the ownership of this site and potential impact on its deliverability have now been resolved. This would be subject to addressing issues such as the suitability of the site access and the relationship of the site with the character of the area and whether it could provide an inclusive form of development. This work is currently ongoing.
- 6.48 **It is recommended that:**
- **Land south of Normanton Road (P4) be proposed to be allocated for around 10 dwellings in the Regulation 19 version of the plan.**
  - **Land West of Redburrow Lane (P7) be proposed to be allocated for around 30 dwellings in the Regulation 19 version of the plan subject to the outcome from further consultation and highway matters being resolved.**
  - **Land to the rear of 55 Normanton Road (P5 & P8) be considered as a potential alternative allocation to P7, for around 23 dwellings, in the event that access issues at P7 cannot be resolved, and subject to the outcome of further consultation and ongoing work.**

### **Ravenstone**

- 6.49 The Regulation 18 consultation document proposed to allocate around 50 dwellings at **Land at Heather Lane (R12).**

6.50 Following the end of the consultation:

- A site assessment has been undertaken in respect of an additional site at **Land off Ibstock Road (R18)** (this site is mapped at **Appendix A**).
- All representations made in relation to the proposed allocation at **Land at Heather Lane (R12)** have been summarised and considered (**Appendix N**).
- All representations made in relation to two other potential housing sites in Ravenstone (**Land at Church Lane (R9)** and **Land off Ibstock Road (R18)**) have been summarised and considered (**Appendix N**).

6.51 A total of 11 representations were made in relation to R12. Comments mainly related to the site access, environmental considerations and whether development of the site was necessary.

6.52 Key points to note are:

- The Highway Authority is satisfied that a suitable access can be achieved as there is a right of access from Beesley Lane.
- The site promoters have since prepared a masterplan which assumes that the overhead power lines will be diverted or placed underground, and on that basis, the site is capable of delivering in the region of 85 to 100 dwellings.
- Some amendments to the policy are required to make clear that:
  - Some hedgerow will be need to be removed to accommodate the access but should otherwise be retained.
  - Odour, noise and turbine impact assessments are required by the Environmental Protection team as part of any future planning application.

6.53 **Land at Church Lane (R9)** was previously discounted on the basis that there was another site in Ravenstone (i.e. R12) which was available and which would not impact upon the Conservation Area or reduce the gap between Ravenstone and the Coalville Urban Area. In light of the shortfall and Ravenstone being considered as an appropriate location for further development given its proximity to Coalville, the suitability of this site has been reconsidered. The site is well-related to facilities and services within Ravenstone and has good access to public transport to Coalville. It is also well-related to the built pattern of Ravenstone. As previously noted, the site would reduce the gap between Ravenstone and Coalville, but it is bound by Piper Lane which provides a logical and defensible boundary to this part of Ravenstone. Any policy requirements for the site would need to incorporate the recommendations of the Council's Conservation Officer to minimise the impact upon the Conservation Area.

6.54 An additional site at **Ibstock Road (R18)** has also now been [assessed](#). Whilst this site does not have any coalescence / heritage constraints, it is further from the facilities and services in Ravenstone and over 800m walking distance from a bus stop. Furthermore, it does not relate as well to the existing built form of Ravenstone and the highways authority has identified concerns with a vehicular access.

- 6.55 In light of the above, it is recommended that, subject to further consultation, **Land at Church Lane (R9)** is allocated for around 50 dwellings.
- 6.56 It is recommended that:
- **Land at Church Lane, Ravenstone (R9) be proposed to be allocated for around 50 dwellings in the Regulation 19 version of the plan, subject to the outcome of further consultation.**
  - **Land at Heather Lane (R12) be proposed to be allocated for around 85 dwellings in the Regulation 19 version of the plan**
- 6.57 The revised provision in the Sustainable Villages is shown in **Table 6**. Those sites not included in the Regulation 18 consultation are *in italics* and are mapped at **Appendix A**.

**Table 6: Proposed Housing Allocations in the Sustainable Villages**

Site Reference	Site Address	Number of dwellings (Approximate)
<b>Sustainable Villages</b>		<b>446</b>
<i>Ap1</i>	<i>Land at Measham Road, Appleby Magna</i>	37
D8	Land off Ramscliffe Avenue, Donisthorpe	32
E7	Land off Midland Road, Ellistown	69
H3	Land adjacent to Sparkenhoe Estate, Heather	37
Mo8	Land off Ashby Road, Moira	49
Oa5	Land at School Lane, Oakthorpe	47
P4	Land South of Normanton Road, Packington	10
<i>P7</i>	<i>Land west of Redburrow Lane, Packington</i>	30
<i>P5 &amp; P8*</i>	<i>Land rear ofc 55 Normanton Road Packington *</i>	23
<i>R9</i>	<i>Land off Church Lane, Ravenstone</i>	50
R12	Land at Heather Lane, Ravenstone	85

\*As an alternative to P7 in the event that satisfactory access cannot be achieved

## **7 THE SUSTAINABLE VILLAGES WITH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANS**

- 7.1 No housing allocations were proposed as part of the Regulation 18 consultation in Blackfordby, Breedon on the Hill, Diseworth, Long Whatton or Swannington. This was on the basis that housing allocations had been, or were in the process of being, allocated in neighbourhood plans. For completeness, the representations seeking the allocation of sites in these settlements are summarised in **Appendix O**.
- 7.2 There are two 'made' neighbourhood plans in the district which allocate sites for housing development. Made neighbourhood plans form part of the development plan and can be attributed full weight in the decision making process. Land east of St George's Hill is allocated for 12 dwellings in the Swannington Neighbourhood Plan and Land rear of 31 Main Street is allocated for 14 dwellings in the Blackfordby Neighbourhood Plan. Both of these sites have been accounted for as housing

commitments.

- 7.3 **Land north of Blackfordby (By6)** was submitted during the Regulation 18 consultation (the site is mapped at **Appendix A**). The decision was made to [assess](#) the site given its scale (43 ha). It has been discounted as a proposed allocation on the basis that it represents a significant scale of development adjacent to the Sustainable Village of Blackfordby. Development of the site would result in the coalescence of Blackfordby, Boundary and Woodville. Whilst close to Woodville (South Derbyshire), such a scale of development is better directed to settlements higher up the North West Leicestershire settlement hierarchy.
- 7.4 The **Breedon on the Hill Neighbourhood Plan** is in the process of being examined. It proposes a housing allocation at **Land north of Southworth Road** for approximately 13 dwellings. A resolution to grant planning permission for 18 dwellings at this site was subsequently agreed at the Council's Planning Committee of 23 September 2024. This site does not form part of the Council's current housing commitments. The Neighbourhood Plan can be attributed full weight if it passes the referendum stage, however, given that there is now a resolution to grant planning permission, it is reasonable to include this site in the figures for the Sustainable Villages.
- 7.5 The **Long Whatton and Diseworth Neighbourhood Plan** is at an earlier stage in preparation. However, the Parish Council has consulted on a draft version of its plan (February to March 2024) and proposed the allocation of **Hathern Road, Long Whatton** for approximately 90 dwellings and **Tea Kettle Hall, Diseworth** for approximately 13 dwellings. However, as the Long Whatton and Diseworth Neighbourhood Plan is at a relatively early stage in its preparation, limited weight can be given to these sites at present.
- 7.6 There is the potential for a further 121 dwellings in the Sustainable Villages of Breedon on the Hill, Long Whatton and Diseworth through the allocation of homes in the Neighbourhood Plans. However, at present, sufficient certainty can only be given towards the 18 dwellings proposed in Breedon on the Hill. The likely contribution of homes from Long Whatton and Diseworth will be revisited at either a later meeting of this committee or as part of the Regulation 19 plan.

## **8 OTHER SETTLEMENTS**

- 8.1 A representation seeks the allocation of **Land at Worthington Lane, Newbold** for housing development as well as a site at **Oaks in Charnwood**. The meeting of this Committee on 14 August 2024 agreed the Settlement Hierarchy (Policy S2) to be taken forward as part of the Regulation 19 plan. This identified Newbold as a Local Housing Needs Village where development is restricted to that meeting a Local Need (Policy S3). The site at Oaks in Charnwood is isolated from any settlement.
- 8.2 For completeness, the representations seeking the allocation of these sites are summarised in **Appendix P**.

## 9 ADDRESSING HOUSING SITES POTENTIALLY IMPACTED BY HS2

- 9.1 As noted above, there are three sites (one in Measham and two in Kegworth) which have planning permission for a total of 677 dwellings, but which also lie on the proposed route of HS2. This route remains safeguarded and there is no indication as to when (or if) it will be lifted. If by the time of the examination the route has not been revoked, then this will represent a risk to the plan in terms of its deliverability, as the aforementioned 677 dwellings have been counted towards the Council's housing growth up to 2042.
- 9.2 **Appendix Q** sets out the pros and cons of three possible options to address this issue.
- Option A is 'do nothing';
  - Option B is to identify a specific reserve site (or sites); or
  - Option C is to include a new policy to set out how the Council would deal with the uncertainty associated with HS2.
- 9.3 Options A and C would avoid the potential problem of having to identify a specific reserve site (or sites) which may or may not be needed, but would result in a lack of certainty, although option C would at least provide a policy basis for considering how the Council would address the loss of these sites if that was to happen. If by the time of the examination the safeguarding has not been removed, then both of these options would be likely to face opposition because of the uncertainty issue. If an Inspector was to recommend that additional sites be included this could be done through a modification to the plan. However, this would result in a delay to the adoption of the plan.
- 9.4 Option B has the advantage of providing clarity as to how this issue would be addressed. It would also be consistent with the approach taken in the adopted Local Plan. However, it would result in uncertainty for residents in those settlements where a reserve site was identified. It would also be likely to generate additional objections to the plan.
- 9.5 On balance, and having regard to the need to make progress, it is considered that option B represents the most appropriate approach. This is allowed for in recommendation 23.
- 9.6 In seeking to identify a specific reserve site (or sites), there are several options:
- Option 1: direct to Measham or Kegworth
  - Option 2: direct to Ibstock
  - Option 3: direct to Measham and Ibstock
  - Option 4: direct to the Coalville Urban Area
  - Option 5: direct to the Key Service Centres
  - Option 6: direct to the Sustainable Villages

- 9.7 These options are described in more detail at **Appendix R**.
- 9.8 Of the options outlined, option 1 on its own is not sufficient to address all of the potential shortfall. Options 2, 4 and 6 are not considered appropriate for the reasons outlined in **Appendix R**.
- 9.9 This leaves options 3 and 5. In terms of option 3, this approach would be consistent with that used in the adopted Local Plan which identified reserve sites in both Kegworth and Measham (policies H3c and H3d of the adopted Local Plan). As noted under option 1 there is a potential site for around 311 dwellings at Measham (M18). However, there are no alternative sites available in Kegworth. Therefore, this would mean allocating additional land at Ibstock in order to maintain the same level of growth at the Local Service Centre. However, as noted at Appendix R significant growth is already planned at Ibstock.
- 9.10 In terms of option 5, in view of the conclusions regarding potential sites on the west side of Ashby de la Zouch, the only realistic option would be to identify land south of Ashby de la Zouch (referred to as Packington Nook (A7)) as the reserve site. However, this site is larger than any shortfall, whether identifying a reserve site at Measham (option1) or directing all of the potential shortfall to Ashby de la Zouch. It would also mean deviating from the agreed distribution of housing development.
- 9.11 One of the purposes of the Local Plan is to provide some certainty to local communities. What happens to the route of HS2 is not in the Council's control and there is no guarantee that it will be retained. In the meantime, identifying reserve sites actually increases uncertainty for local communities. Uncertainty could be minimised by identifying just one reserve site. This being the case the only site that is large enough to address all of the potential shortfall is Packington Nook in Ashby de la Zouch (A7). This would result in very significant growth in Ashby de la Zouch, higher than any other settlement across the district. Whilst the scale of Packington Nook would be greater than the shortfall this would provide a further degree of flexibility if required.
- 9.12 A further consideration is that whilst the majority of Packington Nook is being promoted for housing development, the scheme also includes an element of general needs employment development (9.4ha) on the southernmost part of the site adjoining J12 of the A42. This would improve the sustainability of the Packington Nook development as a whole
- 9.13 If housing at Packington Nook had to be brought forward in the event that the sites at Kegworth and Measham are not developable, the employment land element could help address the current shortfall against general needs requirements as noted in the 16 December 2024 report to this committee.
- 9.14 Notwithstanding this shortfall, a standalone employment development in this location (without the residential element) is not currently considered appropriate due to its poor relationship to Ashby de la Zouch and as such it would not represent sustainable development. The matter of the shortfall will be dealt with in a future report to this Committee.

**9.15** At this time there is no way of knowing whether a reserve site will actually be required. However, to ensure as much protection for the plan as possible, it is recommended that **Packington Nook, Ashby de la Zouch (A7)** is identified as the reserve site in the event that land at Measham and Kegworth remains safeguarded for HS2 or any similar proposal for a rail route. This is allowed for in recommendation 23.

## **10 THE REVISED DISTRIBUTION OF ALLOCATIONS**

10.1 **Table 7** is based on a combination of the housing allocations agreed for the Principal Town and the New Settlement at the 16 December 2024 LPC and the recommendations for the Key Service Centres, Local Service Centres and Sustainable Villages in this report (excluding the consideration of the HS2 issue).

**Table 7 – Revised distribution of housing**

	A	B	C	D	E
	Option 7b Distribution Strategy (%)	Allocations required to 2042 based on 686 dwellings per annum (dwellings)	Revised allocation to 2042 (dwellings)	Revised distribution (%) (C/7,147 x 100)	Difference to preferred development strategy (%) (D – A)
<b>Principal Town</b>	35	2,501	2,457	34	-1
<b>New settlement</b>	35	2,501	1,950	27	-8
<b>Key Service Centre</b>	15	1,072	1,201	17	+2
<b>Local Service Centre</b>	10	715	1,086	15	+5
<b>Sustainable Villages</b>	5	358	446*	6	+1
		<b>7,147</b>	<b>7,140*</b>		

\*These figures do not include the 18 dwellings recently approved in Breedon-on-the-Hill, referred to at paragraph 7.5 above. Adding these 18 dwellings to these figures would result in the residual shortfall being met.

- 10.2 On the basis of what was agreed at 16 December 2024 LPC, and the recommendations set out in this report, there are significant differences to Option 7b in respect of both the new settlement and the Local Service Centres. As set out in the 16 December 2024 report, it is considered that it would not be appropriate to assume more than 1,950 dwellings being delivered from the New Settlement during the plan period.
- 10.3 In terms of the Local Service Centres, the total amount of development (1,086 dwellings) is more than under option 7b (715) and would represent about 15% of all new allocations, compared to the 10% under Option 7b. This would be marginally less than at the Key Service Centres, albeit that the latter are higher order centres in the settlement hierarchy. However, when account is taken of commitments (including the remainder of the Money Hill site at Ashby de la Zouch), then the amount of development during the plan in the Key Service Centres (about 3,200 dwellings) is significantly more than in the Local Service Centres (about 1,900 dwellings).
- 10.4 A significant amount of the growth at the Local Service Centres would be at Measham. This will provide some balance with recent and potential employment development at Junction 11 of the A42. There also remains some uncertainty regarding Measham Waterside as the route of HS2 has yet to be formally rescinded

(as addressed elsewhere in this report).

- 10.5 Whilst there is a clear deviation from the preferred distribution, this is necessary in view of the concerns regarding how much development would actually occur at the New Settlement during the plan period.

## 11 NEXT STEPS

- 11.1 Agreeing the preferred housing allocations is an important step towards finalising the plan under Regulation 19. However, before a future meeting of the Full Council can agree the allocations (and the remainder of the plan) there is much evidence work that needs to be undertaken. In particular, transport modelling, infrastructure delivery and viability assessments need to be undertaken. The latter two pieces of evidence can only be completed once the transport modelling has been completed.
- 11.2 The transport modelling work will need to be commissioned using the Leicestershire County Council transport model. Based on advice from the County Council it is estimated that the transport modelling work will take in the order of 9-12 months. It is complicated by the fact that various other pieces of significant modelling work are being undertaken in the northern part of the district, for example in connection with the Freeport and the New Settlement. There will clearly be an inter relationship between such standalone pieces of work and those for the Local Plan which will consider the plan in its entirety.
- 11.3 It is imperative, therefore, that work on the transport modelling begins as soon as possible. However, if the recommendations in this report are accepted, it will result in several proposed allocations which were not included in the Regulation 18 consultation. These additional sites are shown in **Table 8**.

**Table 8: Additional proposed housing allocation sites**

Site Reference	Site Address	Number of dwellings (Approximate)
<b>Principal Town</b>		
C18	Land off Thornborough Road	105
C19a	Land off Torrington Avenue and Hall Lane, Whitwick	242
C19b	Land off Stephenson Way	780
C90	Land south of The Green, Donington le Heath	62
<b>Key Service Centres</b>		
A31	Land adjacent to 194 Burton Road, Ashby de la Zouch	30
CD9	Land south of Park Lane, Castle Donington	35
<b>Local Service Centres</b>		
lb20	Land rear of 111a High Street, Ibstock	46
K12	Land south of Ashby Road, Kegworth	140
M11	Land off Leicester Road/Ashby Road, Measham	300
M14	Land at Abney Drive, Measham	150

<b>Sustainable Villages</b>		
Ap1	Land at Measham Road, Appleby Magna	37
P7	Land west of Redburrow Lane, Packington	30
R9	Land at Church Lane, Ravenstone	50
<b>Reserve sites</b>		
A7*	Land south of Ashby de la Zouch (Packington Nook)	1,100
P5 & P8**	Land rear of 55 Normanton Road Packington*	23

\* In the event that HS2 safeguarding is not removed

\*\*As an alternative to P7 in the event that satisfactory access cannot be achieved

- 11.4 Some of these sites are significant in terms of their size. All of the sites listed above, with the exception of **C90** and **A31** are included in the SHELAA, a publicly available document on the Council's website.
- 11.5 It is open to the Council to *not* consult on the proposed inclusion of these sites at this time. However, this would mean the first opportunity for any comments would be at the Regulation 19 consultation stage, after the Plan has been agreed by Council. This represents a risk to the plan if new issues emerged at this stage. Such a risk could mean that the plan is not submitted by December 2026.
- 11.6 Consulting on these new sites, however, brings with it separate risks. In particular, as already noted, the transport modelling work will take some time to complete. Any delay in getting this done could have serious consequences for the plan timetable.
- 11.7 Whilst neither approach is risk free, it is considered that there should be some form of consultation in the interests of openness and fairness. **This should only concern those additional sites that it is now proposed be allocated (Table 8) or to identify as alternative allocations should they be required.** Sites that have already been commented upon will not be included. This will be made clear in any consultation material, as will the fact that any comments received about sites previously consulted upon will not be considered.
- 11.8 The consultation will be undertaken as soon as possible after the meeting for a period of six weeks in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI).
- 11.9 It is essential that work in respect of transport modelling can begin as soon as possible. Bearing in mind the need to submit by December 2026, delaying starting this work until after any consultation responses have been reported and considered by this Committee will make this tight. Therefore, the additional sites identified in this report will be included in the transport modelling work in order to ensure that progress can be made. However, if following consultation there are any changes, then these and any implications for the transport modelling will have to be addressed at that point.

<b>Policies and other considerations, as appropriate</b>	
Council Priorities:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Planning and regeneration</li> <li>- Communities and housing</li> <li>- Clean, green and Zero Carbon</li> </ul>
Policy Considerations:	The Local Plan is required to be consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework and other government guidance and requirements.
Safeguarding:	None discernible.
Equalities/Diversity:	An Equalities Impact Assessment of the Local Plan review will be undertaken as part of the Sustainability Appraisal.
Customer Impact:	No issues identified
Economic and Social Impact:	The decision itself will have no specific impact. The new Local Plan as a whole will aim to deliver positive economic and social impacts and these will be recorded through the Sustainability Appraisal.
Environment, Climate Change and zero carbon:	The decision, of itself, will have no specific impact. The new Local Plan as a whole will aim to deliver positive environmental and climate change impacts and these will be recorded through the Sustainability Appraisal.
Consultation/Community/Tenant Engagement:	The Regulation 18 Local Plan has been subject to consultation. Further targeted consultation is proposed. Further consultation will be undertaken at Regulation 19 stage.
Risks:	<p>A risk assessment for the Local Plan Review has been prepared and is kept up to date. As far as possible control measures have been put in place to minimise risks, including regular Project Board meetings where risk is reviewed.</p> <p>The report highlights the potential risks associated with the issues considered as part of the report.</p>
Officer Contact	<p>Ian Nelson            Planning Policy Team Manager            01530 454677  <a href="mailto:ian.nelson@nwleicestershire.gov.uk">ian.nelson@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</a></p> <p>Joanne Althorpe            Principal Planning Policy Officer            01530 454767  <a href="mailto:joanne.althorpe@nwleicestershire.gov.uk">joanne.althorpe@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</a></p>